1	on that point, if I am
2	MS. WALLMAN: Correct. I
3	understand that much. I understand that Mr.
4	Beckner's concerns do go into the prospect
5	that it might be delved into or relied upon
6	for the prospect that Colleen said, "I like
7	it, I get it." I thought we were not talking
8	about that anymore. I thought we were only
9	talking about the first two purposes for which
10	it might be admitted.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes. But I am
12	still getting an objection to the fact if
13	I am understanding the objection, the scope of
14	the objection I understand the objection,
15	but the scope is that you don't even want it
16	in for the purpose of saying that a call was
17	made by that person on that date.
18	MR. MILLS: Well, I would just ask
19	that that part of it be reserved until we have
20	the testimony.
21	MR. BECKNER: But this particular
22	document Exhibit 50 and I not speaking

1	about the others. This Exhibit 50 doesn't say
2	on its face who made the report.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, that is
4	problematic.
5	MR. BECKNER: Okay. I think there
6	are others in here which do say who made the
7	report. But this one here that we are talking
8	about Exhibit 50 doesn't even say who
9	made the report.
LO	MS. WALLMAN: Well, may I just
11	state with respect to using the example of
12	an e-mail, we take the from line to mean that
L3	the person it is from is who it is from. This
L4	is a call report in the apparent format of two
15	attendees. Colleen Dillaway is a Bright House
16	employee. Nico Fasano is a WealthTV employee.
L7	I don't think it takes a great
L8	leap of inference to say that it probably
L9	wasn't Colleen who wrote it. Nico was the
20	only other person there; Nico wrote it.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, the logic is
22	fine. But the you know, the but the

1	evidence, it isn't that tight.
2	Look, I don't think that we should
3	really agonize on this. You say you have a
4	series of call reports, is that correct?
5	MR. MILLS: Yes. There are a
6	number of them, which we can
7	MR. COHEN: 50 and 51 are both
8	Bright House, and then there are more that
9	begin with 99, Your Honor.
10	MR. MILLS: Yes. I have got them
11	
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, why don't we
13	let them all come in as business practice.
14	MR. MILLS: Solely for that for
15	the purpose of
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: Solely for that
17	purpose. And what use gets made of them down
18	the road we just have to get to it when we get
19	to it.
20	MR. MILLS: That is fine.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: We can save some
22	time, if nothing else.

1	MR. SCHONMAN: What numbers are
2	we
3	MR. COHEN: We can help with this.
4	50
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, let's start
6	with 50. And what is another one?
7	MR. COHEN: 51, 99.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: 50 wait a
9	minute. 50, 51, 99. Go ahead.
10	MR. COHEN: 100, 101, 102, 103,
11	104. Any others that you have there?
12	MR. MILLS: Yes. And there is
13	123, 124, and that is it.
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: So that is a total
15	of in addition to what we well, we did
16	50. We just did 50, and I am going to receive
17	50 as identified for purposes of it simply as
18	being one of a series of call reports that
19	were prepared as a business practice in 2004.
20	(Whereupon, the above-referred to
21	document was marked as WTV Exhibit
22	No. 50 for identification, and was

1	received in evidence.)
2	But and after that, there is
3	one, two, three, four, five, six, seven,
4	eight, nine nine in addition to 50. And
5	those are going to be received. Again, they
6	will be identified for the record as call
7	reports, WealthTV call reports, and they will
8	be received at this point solely for purposes
9	of showing that these were prepared as part of
10	a business record in 2004.
11	(Whereupon, the above-referred to
12	documents were marked as WTV
13	Exhibits Nos. 51, 99, 100, 101,
14	102, 103, 104, 123, and 124 for
15	identification, and were received
16	in evidence.)
17	Is it still the same timeframe?
18	Is that right, Mr. Mills?
19	MR. MILLS: I think they are some
20	they may have done in 2005, but 2004/2005.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right.
22	MR. ROSE: So just for clarity,

1	Your Honor, we have the exhibit numbers I
2	wrote down were 50, 51, 99 to 104, 123, 124,
3	and 150. Is that
4	PARTICIPANT: Not 150.
5	MR. ROSE: Not 150, I'm sorry.
6	PARTICIPANT: Everything except
7	150.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, is there I
9	will read them again, 51, 99, 100, 101, 102,
10	103, 104, 123, and 124. All right.
11	PARTICIPANT: Thank you.
12	JUDGE SIPPEL: So that is a help.
13	Where can we go next?
14	MR. COHEN: 52.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. Beckner?
16	MR. BECKNER: I am allergic to
17	this one, Your Honor.
18	(Laughter.)
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: Are you okay?
20	MR. BECKNER: Yes, sure.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right.
22	MR. ROSE: This one is a somewhat

complicated scenario. Let me just try to 1 explain what my understanding is of what the 2 testimony will be as to what it is. 3 Mr. Herring wrote a text. Не 4 5 asked his administrative assistant to send it administrative assistant of 6 the executive at Bright House, and there was a 7 response by the executive to him. 8 So Mr. Herring is actually the author of the text, 9 10 although the e-mails indicate that the administrative assistants exchanged some of 11 12 them. 52 I believe is the whole string, 13 and 53 is a partial string. It is a copy of 14 15 the same thing, but not the entire thing. 52 is the relevant exhibit. 16 17 The meeting -- once again, it is to show what he was pitching, what 18 branding was, what the type of thing he was 19 20 trying to sell is. This one is a bit more 21 than just a reminder of the date, but it is --

obviously, he can talk about what he did

1 1	pitch. But the e-mail opened the door, and
2	then he went in it and pitched it. So two
3	parts of the same thing.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: But it starts off
5	well, I have got I am sure there is
6	another objection. But before I take the
7	other side's objection, this says it is from
8	Robert Herring that is the father to
9	Charles Herring. Subject is WealthTV. And
10	then, it goes down, forwarded message. What
11	actually is transpiring here? This is March
12	of 2008.
L3	MR. ROSE: Robert Herring is a
L4	principal. The e-mails occurred in 2007, but
L5	the top thing is just a record of when it was
L6	printed I believe.
L7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes, I realize
18	that. But what is going on there?
19	MR. ROSE: It was printed off
20	Robert Herring's
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Robert Herring is
22	printing these out for Charles' benefit? This
I	

1	was in March of 2008.
2	MS. WALLMAN: If you could bear
3	with me for one moment.
4	MR. ROSE: We are not quite sure
5	why it was printed that date. Obviously, this
6	proceeding had begun by then, but I don't
7	know.
8	MR. FELD: The relevant
9	informational portion of the e-mail is from
10	Charles Herring to John Scaro on Monday, the
11	12th of February 2007. Again, it is it is
12	not clear why what was printed here was a
13	an additional e-mail, but the substance of
14	part of the submission begins with the from
15	Charles Herring, immediately below that.
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. Well
17	MR. ROSE: Just to continue the
18	circle, another little piece is Exhibit 54,
19	which was Charles Herring instructing his
20	administrative assistant to cut his text into
21	the e-mail that was then sent to the AA for

the Bright House executive.

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well
2	MR. ROSE: 52 and 54 are part of
3	the same thing, essentially.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: And what is 53?
5	How does that fit into the string?
6	MR. ROSE: It is a piece of the e-
7	mail string. It appears to be just copies of
8	what is in 52.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: That is an
10	interesting one. All right. So you've got
11	52, 53, and 54 interrelated, even though 53
12	may be just duplicative. And I am going to
13	ask Mr. Beckner, then, to respond. I mean, it
14	is
15	MR. BECKNER: This is a long
16	chain. I am not sure that, you know, a lot of
17	it is relevant. I mean, we certainly, you
18	know, don't have an objection to a copy of an
19	e-mail that was sent by Steve Miron, you know,
20	which is here of you know, of Bright House
21	to I guess Tavyn Johnson and Charles Herring.
	<u> </u>

And we -- you know, that was sent there.

1	The e-mail from Tavyn Johnson, the
2	fact that the e-mail was sent, we don't have
3	a problem with that. You know, we have a
4	hearsay problem with the content of the e-mail
5	that is being offered for the truth of what is
6	asserted, in particular the statement here,
7	"Bright House, Tamp area, has contacted
8	WealthTV," etcetera, etcetera. You know, that
9	is obvious hearsay.
10	So I you know, I think I
11	don't know that the you know, origin I
12	mean, we are not disputing the fact that Tavyn
13	Johnson, assistant to Charles Herring, sent
14	this e-mail. You know, the origin of that,
15	you know, Mr. Herring can certainly testify
16	to.
17	But we certainly would only want
18	this offered for the not for the truth, not
19	for hearsay purpose, but simply for the fact
20	that this e-mail was sent and this e-mail was
21	received from Steve Miron.

MS. WALLMAN: Your Honor, may I

suggest you take into consideration this group of exhibits in making your ruling. When we get to 54, I think that we will see that Charles is instructing his administrative assistant to cut and paste something that he authored, and send it as a courtesy -- send it to her correspondent, the administrative assistant, to Mr. Miron, and he will testify to that when he presents his testimony.

The e-mail return from Mr. Miron -- Mr. Miron is going to be here, he could be subject to cross examination on anything that I suppose we like. But I think we could take 52, 53, and 54 together. There isn't a substantive hearsay problem here.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I am not going to -- I think there is going to be disagreement on that. But let me -- I am trying to see a -- if there is any -- if there is any thread through here that makes it manageable. I am having -- oh, let me start off by asking the simple question: who is Mr.

1	Miron? I mean, what is his position at Bright
2	House?
3	MR. BECKNER: He is the CEO of
4	Bright House Networks.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: He is the CEO of
6	Bright House.
7	MR. BECKNER: Yes, sir.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: And he will be
9	testifying, you said?
10	MR. BECKNER: That is correct.
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: And, again, I am
12	going to I am going to reject these
13	exhibits.
14	(Whereupon, the above-referred to
15	documents were marked as WTV
16	Exhibits Nos. 52, 53, and 54 for
17	identification, but were rejected
18	as exhibits.)
19	I just can't first of all, I
20	don't think there is no clarity to them.
21	They are most some of them, or most of
22	them, as I am reading them anyway, would be

1	recollection-type documents, which there has
2	been no foundation laid.
3	And the last the one that has
4	the most substance to it is conclusory
5	hearsay, and that was my apparently by
6	direction, pasted together. Well, you know,
7	if you can paste together, good grief, you can
8	speculate until the cows come home as to what
9	we pasted together. I mean, that is really
10	not a reliable description of a document.
11	MS. WALLMAN: Your Honor, if I may
12	
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: I'm sorry. It is
14	not the description of a reliable document.
15	MS. WALLMAN: Your Honor, if I
16	may
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: I am going to
18	receive these. I am going to let the I am
19	going to let them come in, but only if only
20	in connection with the witness.
21	MS. WALLMAN: Thank you, Your
22	Honor.

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: The cross
2	examination witnesses.
3	MS. WALLMAN: Cross examination
4	witnesses?
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: They are cross
6	examination documents. That is correct.
7	MR. MILLS: They are not being
8	admitted into evidence?
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: They are not being
10	admitted into evidence at this point, but they
11	can be used for cross examination of or to
12	from your side of the table, from
13	WealthTV's side, they can be used to
14	attempted to be used to refresh your
15	recollection. And, where pertinent, they
16	certainly can be used for the cross
17	examination of Mr of Bright House's CEO,
18	Mr. Miron.
19	MS. WALLMAN: Naturally, we accept
20	the ruling, Your Honor. There is nothing more
21	germane to this case than what the defendants
22	were told by WealthTV about WealthTV.

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes.
2	MS. WALLMAN: That they knew in
3	the course of making their decision.
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, then, that is
5	why you can use these in that way. I mean, I
6	am not denying you the use of them. You just
7	can't walk them in at this point. And I am
8	going to ask Mr. Schonman I think has
9	something to say to add to this?
10	MR. SCHONMAN: No. I just wanted
11	to clarify that your ruling goes to 52, 53,
12	and 54.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: That is correct.
14	Yes, they are taken as a group, simply because
15	and that includes, you know, duplicate
16	copies, which I am not going to get into now,
17	but we can move to strike those if we you
18	know, if we are serious about these and we
19	when the witness takes the stand. Is my
20	ruling clear?
21	MR. MILLS: The motion is denied,
22	but they can be used for cross.

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: Exactly. Or to
2	or for witness recollection, if used if
3	there is a foundation laid, and if they are
4	appropriate for that purpose. But I don't
5	you know, I don't think we need to go into
6	that now, because we don't know what is going
7	to happen. But you are not all right.
8	That is I can't say anything more without
9	repeating myself. That is how I get in
10	trouble.
11	So 54 is the last one that we have
12	ruled on. WTV Exhibit 55.
13	MR. ROSE: 55 is another record of
14	a meeting that occurred. It is an e-mail that
15	was I am not even sure was copied to Mr.
16	Herring. It is just a record of a call that
17	was made. It is not the call call report
18	format, but simply that another call was made
19	on Bright House in this case.
20	MR. FELD: I believe it is similar
21	to 49, and that it is similar to 45, 47, 49,
22	and, therefore

1	MR. ROSE: Well, it is not to
2	refresh his recollection so much as it is the
3	business record that a call was made.
4	MR. FELD: Oh, okay.
5	MR. ROSE: Once again, the witness
6	won't be there to testify about it, and I
7	believe Your Honor has already ruled on those
8	kinds of exhibits before.
9	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, the call
10	reports there was a definitive ruling on
11	call reports. But I have this kind of
12	document, there is really no definitive
13	ruling. I am inclined to add to reject it,
14	because of all of the reasons that both sides
15	are saying. I mean, there is just no well,
16	there is no witness here to refresh your
17	recollection with. So unless you can give me
18	something better
19	MR. ROSE: I am afraid I can't,
20	Your Honor.
21	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. We will
22	reject it and move on. It is identified and

1	rejected. This is Number 55.
2	(Whereupon, the above-referred to
3	document was marked as WTV Exhibit
4	No. 55 for identification, but was
5	rejected as an exhibit.)
6	Okay. WTV so now you've got
7 -	56.
8	MR. ROSE: 56 sort of mixes these
9	categories. We have an e-mail chain between
10	Mr. Herring and one of his sales employees.
11	It is a listing of calls that that employee
12	had made. It is the last couple of pages of
13	that exhibit, I think the last three pages of
14	it.
15	The first two pages are reports of
16	the back and forth, Mr. Herring to his
17	employee, about the calls, and so forth.
18	MR. COHEN: Your Honor, we object
19	on hearsay grounds. Mr. Furman is not going
20	to testify. The attached report was prepared
21	by Mr. Furman in connection with another
22	document that we are going to show Mr. Herring

1	during his cross examination. He is actually
2	I believe referring to Mr. Furman as the
3	employee who sent in an unauthorized document
4	and was fired. So I don't see how he is going
5	to vouch for the authenticity of Mr. Furman's
6	report.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: All right.
8	MR. COHEN: In fact, I think on
9	cross examination he is going to try to run
10	away from the documents that we are going to
11	show him by claiming that Mr. Furman is not
12	reliable. So I don't see how, without Mr.
13	Furman being here, this document can be
14	admitted.
15	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, how do you
16	feel about that? Who is on this one, Mr.
17	Feld?
18	MR. ROSE: It is the record they
19	kept of the calls that Mr. Furman made. I
20	don't believe it is produced for any other
21	purpose.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, since he is

1	not going to be well, I don't that is
2	not a lone justification for receiving it. If
3	you have a reason to bring it back in again
4	after we get into this other
5	MR. ROSE: There is one other
6	purpose. I am sorry, Your Honor. The
7	advertisers they are targeting is indicative
8	of the kind of genre, if you will. These are
9	advertisers that would advertise in the men's
10	genre. I am sorry to use the word. We
11	weren't comfortable with it this morning, but
12	
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I am
14	comfortable with it. I just think you
15	know, I am having a great time with it.
16	(Laughter.)
17	MR. ROSE: The fact that they were
18	targeting these kinds of advertisers is also
19	shown by this document.
20	MR. FELD: And in that regard, Mr.
21	Herring can certainly testify from his
22	personal knowledge that he instructed his

(202) 234-4433

then-employee Roger Furman with regard to 1 advertising received, the types of advertisers 2 that he was soliciting. 3 MR. COHEN: Well, Your Honor, he 4 5 can testify to those things, but that doesn't cure the hearsay or reliability issue with 6 respect to this document. Mr. Herring can 7 testify to whatever instructions he gave Mr. 8 9 Furman. I'll agree with JUDGE SIPPEL: 10 I mean, the problem that comes to my 11 mind is that, if Mr. Cohen's proffer is true 12 that Mr. Furman is not a -- is not a favorite 13 person over at WealthTV, and what he has done 14 is going to be attacked as either -- for 15 whatever reason, and then this you want to use 16 for purposes of showing that he knew what he 17 was doing --18 MR. FELD: No, Your Honor. 19 may, our offer with regard to this evidence, 20 as I understand it now, is that in fact Mr. 21 Herring will testify to the nature of the 22

I	
1	instructions that he gave to his employees,
2	including Mr. Furman.
3	Mr. Furman was ultimately fired,
4	as Mr. Herring will testify, because, as Mr.
5	Herring will testify, Mr. Furman was not
6	fulfilling those responsibilities in an
7	appropriate manner.
8	The evidence that is offered here
9	is confirmatory to as a confirmatory piece
10	of evidence or a confirmatory report that was
11	made at the time when he was giving
12	instructions to employees saying, you know,
13	"What kind of advertising are you soliciting?
14	Okay. These are the sorts of advertisers we
15	want to have."
16	And that the purpose of the
17	document here is that it is offered as
18	supportive of Mr. Herring's testimony.
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. That's okay.
20	Don't take it any further than that.
21	This is kind of like a wish list
22	though. You don't have advertisers in all of

1	these fields, do you? I mean
2	MR. FELD: No.
3	JUDGE SIPPEL: this was
4	successful. This is what he was trying to
5	target.
6	MR. ROSE: These are calls he
7	made. These are advertisers he was
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, we don't know
9	that. We don't know he made the calls, but
.0	the best I can see out of this, it's a
1	checklist of what would be desired as
2	advertising, which you're saying then the
.3	argument can be made these are all unique for
. 4	men as opposed to men and women.
.5	MR. FELD: To the issue of how
-6	well TV and Mr. Herring is the person
.7	conceptualized and was here testifying as to
L8	how that business plan worked at its target
.9	demographic and so forth and will support that
20	with examples of the sorts of advertising they
21	pursued. It is, we would argue, relevant to

the issues that are being presented here.

1	JUDGE SIPPEL: And you say that
2	this list was made by Mr. Herring and given to
3	the salesman to do? Well, who are we talking
4	about?
5	MR. COHEN: Yeah, Mr. Furman
6	created this list.
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Mr. Furman created
8	the list?
9	MR. COHEN: Yes.
10	MR. FELD: Mr. Furman created the
11	list and sent it to Mr. Herring. Mr. Herring
12	confirmed it, said, "Yes, this is the sort of
13	advertising we want to present."
14	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, when Mr.
15	Herring gets on the stand, if you can
16	establish it that way, then I will receive it
17	for what it's worth as a list of the targets
18	that he and Furman worked out together.
19	That's all I can do with it.
20	So I'm not going to reject it now,
21	but I'm not going to receive it either.
22	That's in the reserve category, and that is